

)	
MIA RIORDAN, a.k.a. Mia Lee,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case No.: 2:10-cv-00081-GMN-LRL
vs.)	
)	
FOREVER 21 RETAIL, INC. et al.,)	ORDER
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	


On October 21, 2009, Plaintiff Mia Riordan, a.k.a. Mia Lee, sued Defendant Forever 21 Retail, Inc. in state court on five causes of action. (*See* #1 at 16–22). The Amended Complaint (“AC”) filed in state court lists five causes of action: (1) Violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Nevada State Law [Chapter 613]; (2) Negligent Supervision; (3) Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress; (4) Wrongful Termination; and (5) Battery. (*See id.* at 8–14). On March 18, 2010, Plaintiff moved under Rule 41 to dismiss her Title VII claims with prejudice and her state law claims without prejudice. (*See* #17). Defendant objected to dismissing the state law claims without prejudice and moved for “summary judgment to dismiss”

1 the state law claims with prejudice. (*See* #22). On May 6, 2010, the Court dismissed the Title
2 VII claims with prejudice but retained jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28
3 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3) without dismissing them or ruling on the “summary judgment to dismiss”
4 motion, as there was still time to respond to the motion. (*See* #23). Plaintiff has now filed a non-
5 opposition to dismissal of the state law claims with prejudice. (*See* #24). In substance,
6 documents 22 and 24 taken together constitute a stipulation to dismiss the remaining state law
7 claims with prejudice.

8 **CONCLUSION**

9 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Dismiss (#22) is GRANTED.

10
11 DATED this 12th day of July, 2010.

12
13 
14 GLORIA M. NAVARRO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24